DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 060 JC 780 150

TITLE	Proceedings [of the] Annual Governor's Workshop for Community College Trustees (1st, Tallahassee, Florida, August 5-6, 1977).
INSTITUTION	Florida State Dept. of Education, Tallahassee. Div. of Community Colleges.
PUB DATE	5 Aug 77
NOTE	41p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Board Administrator Relationship; Community Colleges; Educational Finance; *Educational Trends; Enrollment Trends; *Futures (of Society); Governing Boards; Government School Relationship; Institutional Autonomy; *Junior Colleges; *State School District Relationship; *Trustees
IDENTIFIERS	*Florida; Government Regulation

ABSTRACT

Four addresses presented at the workshop are included in these proceedings. The remarks of Governor Reubin O'D. Askew consider the Florida state system of education, the community college system, and the responsibilities of trustees. William H. Heardy discusses the working relationship between presidents and trustees, the gray area between policy-making and policy-implementation, and the necessity of mutual trust among all parties. Lee G. Henderson reviews the development of Florida's community college system and its state-local governance partnership, in which local control is retained while the state community college agency emphasizes the leadership function, provides a common data system for local management decision-making, and establishes standards of accountability. James L. Wattenbarger reviews current trends, including trends in student enrollment, financial support, and increased outside dominance, in order to provide a view of the community college future. The workshop agenda and a list of participants complete the document. (TR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED151060

PROCEEDINGS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Division of Community Colleges
Education Dept.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FIRST ANNUAL GOVERNOR'S WORKSHOP FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEES

AUGUST 5-6, 1977

HILTON HOTEL

TALLAHASSEE

JC 780 150

FIRST ANNUAL GOVERNOR'S WORKSHOP
FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEES

PROCEEDINGS

Edited by

Division of Community Colleges
Department of Education
State of Florida

The Tallahassee Hilton
Tallahassee, Florida

August 5-6, 1977

FOREWORD

Florida's 197 public community/junior college trustees constitute a body of lay people dedicated to the improvement and maintenance of community college education. Most have active, full-time responsibilities in their communities and have limited time to devote to their responsibilities as trustees. This part-time responsibility often requires full-time effort and demands competent decision-making at all times.

For some time concerns have been expressed by our trustees that certain system-wide matters should be discussed at a joint meeting of all trustees. These concerns range from developments relating to trustee liability to the status of community college governance. In response to these concerns the State Community College Council asked the Honorable Reubin O'D. Askew if he would be willing to co-sponsor such a meeting to discuss critical issues. This request of the Governor to co-sponsor such a meeting appeared particularly appropriate in view of the fact that Florida's community college trustees are appointed by the Governor. A similar request was made to the Community College Trustees Commission of the Florida Association of Community Colleges. The response was the First Annual Governor's Workshop for Community College Trustees.

The Proceedings of this meeting reflect the spectrum of matters discussed formally at the Workshop. The insights and benefits gained by trustees from individual contacts would take considerable more written space than can be afforded here. The evaluations of the meeting were most positive and participants believed the time and effort worthwhile. These Proceedings are provided as information to interested persons who were unable to attend the Workshop and as a reminder of what transpired to those who attended.

Raymer F. Maguire, Jr.
Chairman
State Community College Council

FIRST ANNUAL GOVERNOR'S WORKSHOP
FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEES

August 5-6, 1977

August 5, 1977

1:30 2:00	FIRST GENERAL SESSION Mr. Raymer Maguire, Presiding Chairman, State Community College Council
	WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION Dr. Roger Nichols Deputy Commissioner of Education
2:00 2:30	RESPONSIBILITIES OF TRUSTEES Honorable Reubin O'D. Askew Governor
2:30 3:30	STATUS AND DEVELOPMENTS CONCERNING COMMUNITY COLLEGE FUNDING Mr. Alan Robertson, President Santa Fe Community College
3:30 4:00	BREAK
4:00 5:00	LEGAL LIABILITY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEES Mr. J. Robert McClure Board Attorney Tallahassee Community College
5:00	ADJOURN
7:00	BANQUET/BUFFET TRUSTEE-ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIP Mr. William H. Meardy Executive Director ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEES

FIRST ANNUAL GOVERNOR'S WORKSHOP
FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEES

August 5-6, 1977

August 6, 1977

8:30	SECOND GENERAL SESSION
9:10	THE COMMUNITY-COLLEGE STATE/LOCAL GOVERNANCE PARTNERSHIP Dr. Lee G. Henderson Director Division of Community Colleges
9:10	A LOOK TO THE FUTURE FOR
9:50	COMMUNITY COLLEGES Dr. James L. Wattenbarger Director Institute of Higher Education University of Florida
9:50	
10:10	BREAK
10:10	
10:45	LEGISLATIVE REPORT-UPDATE 77 SESSION Dr. Harold H. Kastner, Jr. Assistant Director Division of Community Colleges
10:45	ROLE OF THE STATE
11:30	COMMUNITY COLLEGE COUNCIL Mr. Raymer Maguire, Chairman
11:30	ADJOURN

REMARKS OF

THE HONORABLE
REUBIN O'D. ASKEW
GOVERNOR OF FLORIDA

I'm very pleased to be here today with trustees from throughout Florida's Community College System.

In becoming trustees, you have accepted a responsibility of great significance. It is a responsibility which will require sacrifice, dedication and patience on your part, if we are to maintain and improve one of the nation's largest and finest State Community College Systems.

Each of you, in your own way, is a recognized leader in your respective communities. You already have demonstrated a concern and commitment to shouldering the burdens of community action.

And now, as trustees, you shoulder a new burden . . .the effective and efficient operation of Florida's 28 community colleges.

During these two days of workshop training, you are discussing and learning about vital aspects of community college operations. These subjects run the gamut -- from personnel relations and financial affairs to the shared responsibility we have for community colleges through State and local authorities.

I fully appreciate the job you have to perform. That job takes on added importance when you consider that our community colleges are not geared solely to transmitting course material to thousands of students. To the contrary, community colleges are an integral part of our communities, for they help people to effectively cope with the world around them.

And, this should always be a purpose of education . . . not merely to inform, or even to entertain. Education must impart knowledge that will enable us to make our way in the world.

All of you are familiar with some of the basic responsibilities you have acquired as trustees. If I could pick out just one to hold foremost in your minds, it would be for you to make decisions which give priority concern to students.

Our entire system of education in Florida, and in this country, revolves on the premise that our best hope for the future rests with those who will inherit it.

And that simple truth makes education a concern not only for government, but a concern for every community, every business and every individual.

If you temper your deliberations and your decisions with this basic truth, Florida will benefit from your efforts.

Florida, as you know, was the first state in this nation to develop and implement a comprehensive plan for community colleges. This significant accomplishment serves as a model to the rest of the nation. For we have acted to extend the opportunity a community college education offers within the reach of virtually every resident of our State.

In just one year's time, our community college network serves about half-a-million people with a diverse educational offering. That figure speaks well for the value community colleges represent within their area of service.

Many people are unaware that community colleges have a curriculum much broader than just a college transfer program.

There are personal enrichment courses, for individuals who seek a way to improve themselves. There are adult basic education courses. There is a pre-medical program. And, among many other courses, our community colleges offer a first-rate vocational-technical training program, for people who want to learn a trade without a four-year or more college career.

Certainly our Community College System actively serves and benefits the thousands of people enrolled in the various programs offered on the 28 campuses. But all of us truly are served well by the community colleges, for they offer so many of our fellow citizens the tools with which to improve their lives.

In addition, each of our community colleges provides a center for free thought, cultural appreciation and social interaction by people from diverse backgrounds.

Seen in this light, we can better understand the important role played by the Boards of Trustees at each of the community colleges.

You are not administrators and you are not members of the faculty.

As trustees, you are the guiding force for your respective community colleges. You are the policy-makers who must point the way for our community colleges to overcome some of the special problems they encounter.

The districts which you serve are, in some respects, very different. Problems within the system may differ from one community college to the next. And, as a result, it is likely that solutions to many of these problems may differ from one community college to another.

That is why we have a Community College System governed by Local Boards of Trustees. The people who are closest to the district and know the problems are charged with making decisions for the educational needs of the districts.

Many of you are familiar with a proposal by the State Community College Council to reestablish a State Community College Board.

I'm aware that there are some genuine differences of opinion among you regarding the creation of such a Board.

I want you to know that I still recognize the value of a very close relationship between community college decisions and the people who are closest to the individual community college's needs. I believe we must continue to insure that the system remains responsive to the needs of its colleges.

Within the next two or three months, the Community College Council will be completing a more detailed proposal for establishment of the Board. I am interested in their findings and look forward to reviewing the proposal.

I hope that you, too, will carefully review the proposal and consider the issue in the best interests of the Community College System and the people it serves.

I want to stress again that local direction of community colleges has proven to be a productive and effective approach. It is an approach that will continue to be meaningful to the community college program in Florida.

And you have some very recent evidence that the Legislature and I agree on the value of Local Boards of Trustees to the system.

The Legislature passed a bill this year granting Boards of Trustees final authority in selecting and appointing presidents to fill community college vacancies. A key provision of the new law gives trustees authority to take action without a recommendation from the community college president.

While I had some mixed emotions about the bill, I reconciled the issue in favor of the trustees by allowing it to become law. This underlines the emphasis we have placed on the trustee system for our community colleges.

But there also is a need for systemwide coordination of many of our community college programs and policies. We should actively examine any reasonable method for improving that coordination.

This workshop, sponsored by the State Community College Council and me, is designed specifically to help the trustees who <u>are</u> critically important to the welfare of our community colleges.

Dr. Lee Henderson and his staff in the Division of Community Colleges want to assist you in becoming more proficient and effective trustees.

Your attendance here today and your commitment to diligently carry out your responsibilities as trustees is the best indication to me that a brighter future lies ahead for our community colleges.

I am grateful for your dedication to education in our State.

I wish you all much success in maintaining and improving our very fine Community College System

Thank you.

WORKING RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN

PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEES

William H. Meardy, Executive Director
Association of Community College Trustees

Distinguished platform guests, ladies and gentlemen. ACCT is proud and honored to be a part of this most important First Annual Governor's Workshop for Community College Trustees. The Governor and the planners of this meeting are to be congratulated for putting together the kind of viable program that is needed in order to better improve the tools of boardsmanship for lay trustees.

When this kind of program is put together for this large of a gathering of trustees, you run the risk of having these trustees return home and then asking some questions of the administration that perhaps the chief executive would rather not have been asked. I would rather believe that it is more important for trustees to know what are the right questions to ask than to remain home in a vacuum and not ask any questions at all. Therefore, I commend the sponsors of this workshop for taking a most important step in the right direction.

I have been asked to speak with you this evening about the working relationships between presidents and trustees. I probably should begin by saying that in some instances there appears to be a gulf between "what is" and "what should be" pertaining to those relationships. In part of what I have to say, the shoe will fit and I will be stepping on some of your toes. In other instances some of you will agree with much of what will be discussed and will return home reinforced with the belief that your relationships with one another are established on a sound foundation.

In my humble opinion, the cornerstone of the successful operation of any institution is the degree of success enjoyed by the board and its chief executive pertaining to board/president relations. If there is 100% trust and confidence

experienced between the two, then freedom exists to devote the entire attention, time and efforts of the board to governing effectively and the president is free to devote 100% of his or her time in ministering to the needs of the institution and to the students whom we all serve.

Chip away at the cornerstone of trust and you threaten the stability of all that it supports. And, the disturbing thing is, you cannot keep the situation a secret. The situation resembles that of an earthquake. Once it happens the feeling that the foundation of trust has been threatened or crushed reverberates throughout the institution. Everyone feels the shock waves. If allowed to continue, the resulting deterioration of the institution cannot help but to eventually have an effect upon the quality of instruction. When that happens, that board, collectively, and that president, individually, have violated that sacred trust that has been placed in their hands - the very institution itself - the students.

I am sorry to report that as I travel around the country I am observing that in all too many instances, relationships between some boards and some presidents are not living up to the standards to which I know you subscribe. It is difficult to point the finger as to who is at fault. However, distrust must begin somewhere. It is like the chicken and the egg - which came first? What is especially disturbing to me is that ACCT is caught up in this situation.

For years I have gone about the country proudly proclaiming that ACCT's biggest booster club is made up of college presidents. I still say that! But I have been sobered by the knowledge that some college presidents do not believe, as we do, that a better educated board of trustees, a more knowledgeable board, a more involved and understanding board is going to be more supportive of the role of the president.

Fortunately, the vast majority of boards which have acquired better tools of boardsmanship, as a result of our efforts, have indeed strengthened the position of

the presidents. Many, many presidents have told me this. I do not want to gloss over that fact because one of the cornerstones of ACCT is built upon that premise. As a former college administrator, I will not be a party in any way to participating in any plan or activity that decreases support for the chief executive.

However, in spite of good and honorable intentions, we have not been 100% successful. Some trustees have, as a result of their own local experience, ACCT's publications, seminars and conventions, gotten themselves involved in attempting to administer the college. I am simply suggesting that you "knock it off". That is not your job or your responsibility. Fortunately, and as a result of your own local experiences, ACCT's publications, seminars and conventions, most trustees now better understand wherein lies that potential of conflict with the chief executive.

You trustees have learned that the line between policy-making and policy-implementation is not a line at all. It is a grey area. To make matters more difficult, that grey area is slightly and constantly shifting back and forth. In that shifting grey area the seeds of the threat to board/president relations are contained. Some trustees enter that area unknowingly. In doing so, they tend to infringe upon the job of the president who has been hired to administer the college. I suspect that some trustees enter that area not unknowingly. This is especially tempting if a particular trustee happens to be or to have been an educator employed in another educational entity.

When this happens the president finds himself/herself in a very awkward position. It is hard to imagine a president going up to a trustee and reminding him that he has interfered in administration. If the chairman of the board or another trustee does not point this out (and I believe someone should) then the situation is allowed to fester. This could eventually contaminate a positive psychological climate existing between the board and the president.

But, now let us turn our attention to the president himself. I seriously doubt that he has been 100% innocent in this situation. Is it not possible that the president created a situation that invited this incursion on the part of one or more board members (or perhaps the entire board) into that realm normally reserved for the chief executive?

I would like, at this time, to forthrightly identify the one situation that would and does entice board interference -- that is lack of full disclosure on the part of the college's chief executive. In nearly every case that I have heard of charges of board interference in administration, I have found evidence that the bond of trust and that line of credibility which ought to and must exist between the board and the president has been broken. Once that happens I would suggest that the president either get himself another board or the board get itself another president. Once any board has been caught by surprise, been embarrassed or perhaps even been sued, it is understandable why they become gun-shy -- why they start asking questions. And these questions may well be questions that conceivably impinge upon the office of the president. The board begins to wonder, "What else do we not know about?" So they begin to dig.

In extreme cases the board may hire its own administrative secretary. That happened last year in Illinois. In another state I found a college where the board of trustees maintains an office on campus. Is not the reason blatantly obvious? I take that board to task for not doing its job sooner than it did. The president was fired but not until he had been there ten years. The level of morale at that institution could hardly have gone lower. A new president is now in office. The board's office is still there on campus. To me, that is a pity. The message is obvious -- mistrust still exists. Or, at least the potential mistrust still exists.

Before I would have accepted the position as president, I would have demanded - yes, demanded - that the office be eliminated. I would have pledged to that board my promise to full disclosure. And until I broke that promise, the

continued presence of the board office would remain an insult to me personally and would of necessity severely damage, perhaps irreparably, the positive psychological climate that should and must exist between us. Therefore, to you presidents I simply plead full disclosure to your boards.

The challenges facing the office of the president today are enormous. Presidents need and indeed must have that very real and strong support of their respective boards in order to survive. To you presidents I say that the day of the rubber stamp board is gone. The Chancellor or president who still might have one is a vanishing breed. Both you and your board are courting disaster with your "go it alone" attitude.

And, to you trustees - please know that being a college president today is not fun any more. It is today an even more frustrating, demanding, challenging and threatening job than ever before in history. The president has enough facing him ahead without looking back over his shoulder wondering if the board is backing up his behind. The president must be secure in the knowledge that he has your support. And, do not leave that knowledge of support to chance. Make that knowledge abundantly clear. When this happens, it will be mirrored in the face of the executive. It will be reflected in his smile, his attitude and in the way he goes about administering the institution. Call it care and feeding of the president if you like. But after all he or she is human too -- not a machine. They also thrive on love.

Lastly, I have a specific message for the Chairman of the Board. Yours must be a special relationship with the chief executive. Your lines of communication with one another must be especially effective. The Chairman must be supersensitive to the needs of the president especially as they relate to his dealings with the other board members.

The president should only be responsible to the Chairman of the Board. All requests from the board (and therefore any individual on the board) should be channelled through the Chairman.

I know of one case where an entire college administration was strapped for time because individual trustees were going directly to individual administrators asking for this and asking for that. Most trustees were unaware that other trustees were asking for similar or dissimilar information. Meanwhile, the president was beside himself as to how to correct the situation. Had there been the kind of relationship existing between the president and the board chairman which I have described, then the chairman would have moved in and diplomatically handled the solution - at the same time protecting the president.

I have sometimes been criticized for using the term "governance/management team" in referencing boards of trustees and presidents. I make no apology for the use of that term. I simply repeat again that better educated trustees in the art of boardsmanship plus the practice of full disclosure on the part of the president, will result in a smooth functioning team effort on behalf of the institution and the student.

At the bottom line of the accountability ledger is the word "student". And, ladies and gentlemen, that is where we had better be as well. To get there we must go all the way back to the trustee's most important responsibility - the selection of the chief executive. Then, through the creation of sound policies let that president lead the institution in the achievement of its goals and objectives. Give him the credit for the achievement of those successes. Support him in his hour of need. Working together as a team you will reach that bottom line - together. That is where it's all at.

That is why you are called a trustee - you have been given a trust. Nobody ever said that your job as a trustee was going to be easy. Lots of people could

have been chosen to accomplish an easy job. And, few, if any people, are going to come up to you and say, "thank you".

There are no students here today. But, as a former student personnel administrator I will speak for them. I know that they appreciate the great job that you are doing. Their message is short and it is sincere. It is simply, "Thank you trustees. Keep up the good work!" -- Thank you.

THE STATE-LOCAL GOVERNANCE PARTNERSHIP IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Lee G. Henderson, Director
Division of Community Colleges
Florida Department of Education

As an introduction to and as a part of my comments on the state-local governance partnership, I must take this opportunity to say a word of appreciation to each of you.

Florida does have an outstanding system of community colleges, and the quality of this system is recognized nationally. This quality is due to many factors. First, our system is the result of a carefully designed and implemented plan for providing postsecondary education to citizens of this State. Second, it is based on a well thought through and sound legal framework. Third, we have an unusual balance of local control with State coordination and support. Finally, and often overlooked as a reason for the excellence of our system, is the high quality of the control exercised at the local level.

When I speak of control, I am speaking both of the quality of management and of policy making. I am sure it is no surprise to most of you when I tell you that, as a group, our chief administrative officers are the finest of any state in the country. If there is any doubt in your minds, you need only look at the positions of national leadership that our presidents have in the past and currently do occupy. Proportionately, our presidents have occupied more positions of leadership in regional and national organizations than presidents from any other state.

This quality of managerial leadership is a credit to trustees . . . to yourselves, and to others like you, who have done such a good job in establishing screening processes, in reviewing candidates who met minimum standards prescribed by the State, and in selecting chief executive officers of such high quality and competence.

This is but one example of areas in which trustees of Florida's community colleges have performed so well. Trustees are also now assuming positions of responsibility at the regional and national levels. I am proud of the Governors who have appointed you; and you should be proud of the way in which you have performed in your public trust.

Your service is best described in the Beatitudes of a Leader, written by an unknown author, which reads:

Blessed is the leader who has not sought the high places, but has been drafted into service because of the ability and willingness to serve.

Blessed is the leader who knows where he is going, why he is going, and how to get there.

Blessed is the leader who knows no discouragement, who presents no alibi.

Blessed is the leader who knows how to lead without being dictatorial; true leaders are humble.

Blessed is the leader who seeks for the best for those he serves.

Blessed is the leader who leads for the good of the most concerned, and not for the personal gratification of his own ideas.

Blessed is the leader who develops leaders while leading.

Blessed is the leader who marches with the group, interprets correctly the signs on the pathway that leads to success.

Blessed is the leader who has his head in the clouds but his feet on the ground.

Blessed is the leader who considers leadership an opportunity for service.

The State of Florida is indebted to each of you for the quality of your service.

Florida is recognized nationally for its delicate balance of local control with planning and coordination, financial support and accountability being provided on a statewide basis. I recognize that there are two sides to everything including the

appropriate responsibilities of the local board and of the State. As the wise old Indian said, "He who travels alone travels faster, but he who travels alone, falls alone, and picks himself up alone."

But regardless of which side you view, it is true that no state has a great system without the appropriate assignment of responsibilities at the state and at the local level. There are states such as Texas in which the total community college development has been at the local level with little statewide input. Texas has some outstanding colleges (and some very wealthy colleges because of oil money), but it also has some mediocre colleges. There is an apparent lack of consistency in the quality of institutions which we find in this state. On the other hand, there are states such as Georgia and Minnesota where the control is totally at the state level with no local boards nor any local initiative. In these cases you find institutions that are largely academic and not particularly responsive to community needs and community differences. Such states are not generally considered among those states having outstanding systems of community colleges.

Florida's first four colleges were developed almost completely as a result of local initiative with little input or support from the State level. But, beginning in 1957 with the completion of the State plan, the secret of our success has been largely due to the delicate balance between state and local authority and responsibility. At that time, community colleges were developed as components of local school systems and local control was assured through operation of the colleges by boards of public instruction. That plan further provided for the establishment in the Department of Education a Division of Community/Junior Colleges, and was followed by legislative action creating a State Junior College Board, which, operating under the general supervision of the State Board of Education, was given responsibility for "establishing statewide policy regarding the operation of public community college, and for determining ways to affect articulation of these institutions with other educational agencies." The Division

of Community Colleges and the State Junior College Board provided state leadership and coordination during the major developmental period of the community college system in Florida.

Then during the period from 1968 to 1970, a series of legislative acts, including a major governmental reorganization program, reaffirmed and strengthened the concept of local control of community colleges along with state level responsibilities for coordination, planning and leadership. In 1968 the authority for operating community colleges was transferred from local school boards to boards of trustees which were appointed by the Governor, and "vested with the responsibility to operate their respective junior colleges and with such necessary authority as may be needed for the proper operation thereof in accordance with regulations of the State Board." (Section 230.757, F.S.). These boards of trustees, however, had no taxing authority, and from 1968 and until 1971 local support continued to come from the taxing authority of the local school districts. Effective in 1971, local school districts were relieved of any responsibility for levying taxes for community colleges, and community colleges funding became, in effect, a combination of state funds and students fees.

As a part of this change in financial support, the legislature wrote into the Statutes a strong reaffirmation of local control, stating that "It is the legislative intent that junior colleges continue to be operated by district boards of trustees as provided in Section 230.753(2), Florida Statutes, and that no department, bureau, division, agency or sub-division of the State shall exercise any responsibility and authority to operate any junior college of the State except as specifically provided by law or regulations of the State Department of Education (Section 230.753. F.S.)."

At the same time that responsibility for local control was being reaffirmed and strengthened by the assignment of specific statutory authority to the boards of trustees, the coordinating role of the State was being more clearly spelled out

in the governmental reorganization act of 1969. It is worth noting that the purpose of this act as stated in the declaration of the policy was to enable the executive branch "to achieve maximum efficiency and effectiveness and to provide for improved management and coordination of State services." This law further provided that the Board of Education and the Commissioner were to assign to the Division of Community Colleges "such powers, duties, responsibilities, and functions as shall be necessary to insure the greatest possible coordination, efficiency and effectiveness of the community colleges." Within the Department of Education this law provides for coordination both within the system of community colleges and all other components of the State system of education.

While this partnership effort has seen Florida through a period of growth and development that is probably unparalleled, I have noticed that in recent years as we move from a rapidly expanding system more toward a steady state or slow enrollment growth, there is increasing frustration at the local level, and increasing fear that control will follow support from the local level to the state level.

These concerns are understandable. You have been besieged by pressures from a variety of governmental agencies for increased reporting. You have been besieged with regulations and demands from a variety of State and federal agencies. At the same time the tax resources available to you have substantially diminshed in terms of real dollars.

But in spite of these very legitimate concerns, I submit to you that today you have more freedom to make decisions at the local level than ever before in the history of Florida community colleges. During the past decade, the State has systematically and consistently eliminated controls and regulations over decisions and processes which are rightfully best decided at the local level . . . at the scene of the action as it were.

Did you realize, for example, that prior to 1968 the State specifically controlled the number of administrators and non-teaching professionals employed by community colleges?

Did you know that prior to that time the State specifically determined each individual space in a building, and rigidly controlled the size of classroom, laboratories and office spaces that you constructed?

Did you realize that during those early days the State individually approved each course in vocational and adult areas which were to be funded from the State level?

Did you realize that in those days attendance had to be taken and funds were allocated on the basis of the number of hours that students were in attendance in formally organized classes?

Did you realize that prior to 1968, the State required and reviewed monthly financial reports including detailed information by revenue and expenditure accounts?

In those early days every community college professional had to have a certificate based primarily upon certificate requirements developed for public schools. The certificate requirements have been systematically changed to be more responsive to needs of community colleges and now the law permits colleges to develop their own sets of competencies for professional employees, which may be used as a substitute for the State certification requirements.

These are but few of the areas in which you have less reporting and more authority than you had in the past. But as you are given more and more authority over the inputs and processes of the operation of your college, conversely, you have an increasing obligation to be accountable to the public which you serve and which provides the funds for your operation.

Toward that end, the State role is continuingly being modified to re-emphasize the leadership function of the State agency; to provide a common data

system which is designed to give you data at the local level on which to base management decisions, and to give you data which will enable you to compare the operations of your college with those of each of the other 28 colleges; and finally, to provide standards of accountability, which comprise a system for the exercise of control by local boards yet provide the basis for an accounting of your stewardship to the State Board of Education, to the Legislature, and ultimately to the public. These standards are designed to measure the results of the decisions you make, and to insure that those decisions do result in programs of high quality and in efficient operation of the institutions which are intrusted to you.

I share with you the feelings that State control would be a great detriment to the quality of community colleges in Florida. The greatest threat to that local control would be irresponsible actions on the part of any local board. Conflict, hostility, and irresponsible actions in any college inevitably affect the entire system. As the Eskimo points out "The speed of the dog sled in a race is determined by the slowest dog," and so the amount of authority that your legislature is willing to delegate is ultimately determined not by the board which best exercises that authority, but by the board and the college at which the exercise of local control produces the least satisfactory results.

The greatest deterrent to either standardization or State control is the track record of each of your colleges, which in 20 years of local control and State coordination have not only developed into a system serving the majority of the posteducational needs of the State, but have provided the leadership for reform and renewal for all of education in Florida.

For the foreseeable future, the Division of Community Colleges and the Department of Education will continue to offer leadership and coordinate the elements of our community college system in a manner which will encourage an interchange of ideas, foster initiative and creativity in individual institutions, provide stimulation through evaluation, and encourage each institution to meet

the needs of its particular community within the framework of an overall State plan.

In carrying out our responsibilities, at the State level, we are cognizant of the need for assistance and participation from trustees, and are actively seeking ways of increasing your input into decision making at the State level. You are aware that the Division has cooperated with the Trustees Commission of FACC. You are aware that trustees are represented on our committee to review proposed changes in State Board Rules. And, you are aware that this year we have reactivated the State Community College Council with a membership composed of active local trustees to advise us in the carrying out of our State level responsibilities.

We look forward to your continued input, and are seeking ways to maximize our partnership efforts, so that our colleges can adapt to a changing environment and can continue to provide quality and efficient educational services to the citizens of this great State.

Community Colleges Face Critical Problems

-- Through A Glass Darkly --

James L. Wattenbarger, Director
Institute of Higher Educat on
University of Florida

There was never a time when community colle ges didn't face critical problems. During the early history of the community college development, we chafed at our association with secondary schools. Later we chafed at the snobbery of the four-year colleges and universities. More recently we find ourselves generally accepted as a part of "higher education" -- we have arrived -- but at a time when higher education has apparently grown in disfavor with the general public and especially with the legislatures. In many states financial support has deteriorated, costs have increased, criticism has mounted, and even student enrollment has decreased. The traditional awe with which Joe Public regarded college education has visibly diminished. The financial cutbacks have forced budgets to become all salary expenditures leaving little or nothing at all for development and exciting expansion.

The resulting clamor from inside the colleges has resulted in a little progress outside the colleges. In fact, continued and even increasing disfavor has often resulted. State answers to the problems as well as to faculty inability to react positively to them has often resulted in a new round of state regulation and state impingement upon traditional autonomies. There are further complications stemming from increasing supervision and regulation from a variety of federal agencies, representatives of many of which have never visited a community college at all.

This uncertainty leads one to cry rather than ask . . . what may we expect from the future? In order to understand the answer to that question, we need to examine some of the trends which we currently can identify.

FUTURE DIRECTION NUMBER ONE: CHANGES IN STUDENT ENROLLMENT

Historically, one of the distinguishing characterisitcs of American society has been the long term and constant expansion of educational opportunity in this country. As our higher education moved from the elitism of educating solely the leaders, through the meritocracy of educating, in addition, those who had a defined ability, up to the concept of higher education for everyone, an increasing faith in the efficacy of education was a hallmark of each of the United States. At first, we used the rationale that we need educated people to participate in a democratic governing structure; then we became also concerned about the need for scientific and technical advances for the development and protection of the country at large; and, finally the need for individual vocational competence (even though changing throughout a lifetime) took precedence. Each of these is still a valid goal but to these we've added sufficient refinements to make education a right of each and not a privilege of a few.

Expansion of opportunity has not been continuous nor universally supported, however. There are those who view with alarm the continuation of expanded opportunity for a number of reasons. Some of the reasons are centered in philosophical commitments; others are related to concerns for quality; and, still others have specific relationships to costs. Education does require an allocation of resources which otherwise could be assigned to different purposes. Galen Drury of the University of Georgia recently described the Expansive and Restrictive forces affecting higher education, naming the faculty, the accrediting agencies, and the professionals as favoring restrictions while the students, the alumni, and the legislators continuously moved from one position to another and the college administrators, the boards of trustees, and the general public favored expanding opportunity.

You are in this latter group and persons with your commitments and values have led the way by encouraging the development of land grant colleges, junior

colleges, and community colleges. As a result, the 3% figure of the youth who attended colleges in 1900 has increased to almost half of the same age group attending in 1970 (and there was a period during the 1960's when the percentage exceeded one-half). This expansion is not likely to be reversed -- nor is it likely to be appreciably increased within the immediate future. We may expect half of the 18-21 year age group to continue their education in a formal manner upon completing high school. Since the number who complete high school is not 100 percent of the age group, I am saying that about 55 to 75% of the high school graduates will continue their education upon graduating. Since the age group is currently decreasing in size, this will actually mean in many states fewer students.

In the future, there will be a smaller increase in the number of students in the 18-21 year old age bracket who will attend college than has been true in years prior to 1975. In fact there will be some decrease in number in many states. As a result, there will be strong competition among the various types of colleges and universities for these particular students. The emphasis upon university parallel programs in the community colleges will therefore be less pressing than has been the case during the 1960's and early 1970's. Conversely the emphasis upon specific occupational preparation will be very much greater than has been true.

In other words there will be a perceptible increase in the expandability of higher education for students studying traditional college courses -- in fact there will more than likely be decreases. On the other hand hopefully there will be a concomitant increase in demand for programs related to occupational preparation.

The Impact

This change will have multiple effects upon the program planning and relevance of the community college mission. These changes in student characteristics will result in:

1. Increased emphasis upon cooperative education.
2. A revision of general education.
3. More concern for part-time students.
4. More emphasis upon community orientation.
5. Emphasis upon education for older citizens.
6. Corrective education and individual self development.
7. The community college -- an education broker.
8. Return of bachelors degree holders for occupational program.

FUTURE DIRECTION NUMBER TWO: FINANCIAL SUPPORT

The level of financial support for higher education has been reported by all observers as inadequate since the early 1970's. In a number of states this lack of adequate support has applied to community colleges and senior colleges alike; in other states, however, there has been a more favorable attitude and resultingly more positive support for the community colleges than for other levels of higher education. The community colleges are affected, however, by the attitudes toward higher education which are generally held in a state. They cannot escape that fact.

As noted earlier, it is an anomaly, perhaps, that after struggling for 50 years to become an accepted member of "higher" rather than "secondary" education, the community colleges now find themselves accepted as a part of the level of education about which the public has most serious questions.

There have been several ways in which problems related to financial support have been identified. These have resulted in:

1. Limitations to enrollment.
2. Changes in sources of community college funding.
3. Results in "accountability."
4. Community college philosophy and source of support.

5. Emphasis upon cost based funding formulas.

6. Implications of collective bargaining agreements.

All of these are related to a possible closing of the "open door," because even though natural causes would seem to result in fewer students, some decision makers want to impose even further restrictions on enrollments.

Limitations on Enrollment

The dominant themes which may be identified in the community college literature, as well as the funding criteria developed therefrom, could provide a basis for the sound expansion of educational opportunity at this period in the twentieth century. The commitment of the part of the state legislatures is not so clear, however. State after state has experienced pressures to limit enrollments by one method or another. These may be described as follows:

1. Limitations on programs. This is often accomplished through requiring state agency approvals or by the legislature specifying that certain programs will not receive state support.

2. Financial caps on funds made available. This is accomplished by appropriating a specified amount which is not corrected in the subsequent sessions thereby throwing any additional support for enrolled students back to the local institution.

3. Legislative limits placed on the specific number of students who may be supported. This is accomplished by a single statute or by limiting increase to a set percentage of existing enrollment.

4. Legislative limits placed on functions which may be supported. This is accomplished by excluding or limiting part-time enrollments, or noncredit course enrollments, by limiting the age groups who may be supported, or limiting the time of day for which FTE may be reported.

The Future

Even though more current writers in the community college field are giving heavy emphasis to "community based community services," the support patterns for these programs and courses will continue to lag. Community college services will be limited by the available financial support provided from the state legislatures and/or local sponsoring agencies; many services will be curtailed even though there is identified need for them.

Changes in Sources for Community College Support

Historically, community colleges have resulted from a strong local orientation, though the trend for financial support has almost always been toward more support from state sources. The use of local property taxes as a major source of community college support has decreased for many reasons which are not associated with community college philosophy at all. The concern for equalizing opportunity for all citizens within a state has been a major factor, however, in moving to increased state-level support. An emphasis upon statewide planning has resulted in statewide responsibility sometimes even in lieu of local responsibility.

The Future

There will be, unless current trends are reversed, an increase in the amount of state support for community colleges with an accompanying decrease in the amount of local support. The effects this action will have upon the governance structure will vary from state to state. Some states will maintain a strong local control; other states will move to more state domination, not solely because of state support but as a result of state leadership's desire to exercise more direct influence upon total expenditures and operational policies of the institutions. Increased state support will provide a rationale for intended action which would likely be accomplished in any case.

Result of Accountability

The continuing emphasis upon accountability has been a specific product of the serious questions raised about higher education and of the trends in planning at the state level. The need to measure outcomes, to compare them with inputs, to compute cost efficiency and/or cost effectiveness, to evaluate the effect of alternative actions -- these represent the attitudes and expectations of those who allocate funds whether they come from local or state sources. The potentials of the computer enable college administrators to analyze information in ways that were previously too time consuming to be practical. This provides a sound basis

for selecting alternative actions in a variety of situations and should improve decision making.

The Future

There will be increased emphasis upon accountability and the measurement of outcomes. Although currently Management Information Systems (MIS) definitions are vague in most states, the need for comparable information will tend to force commonalities in definitions to be identified. Simulation will be used more and more often at state as well as instructional levels. The use of common MIS definitions will permit comparisons which will be misinterpreted and even misused unless there is an adequate understanding of community college programs and operations.

Community College Philosophy and Sources of Support

As has been noted, there will be a continuing increasing shift from local to state support for community colleges. Another tradition, that of maintaining no or at least low tuition for students attending these institutions, is receiving serious examination. The tendency to increase tuition at least in line with increasing cost is almost universal. In only a very few instances have the community colleges actually been able to reduce the portion of total costs that students pay by any appreciable amount. The range between a low of 5% up to almost 40% of the current operating expenditures has been typical in most states for many years. Only one state, California, has even attempted to maintain the semblance of "free" tuition -- Hawaii, Oregon, and Puerto Rico also report, however, no income for current operation from this source. Lombardi even refers to the no-tuition or low-tuition philosophy as a myth. Terhune recently noted that increasing tuition had a more deleterious influence upon the attendance of part-time minority students than upon the enrollment of the full-time minority students. On the other hand, studies by several major organizations have

recommended increased student tuition. This variety of positions results in a confused picture of the probable trends.

The Future

It is safe to predict, however, that tuition is not likely to be eliminated within a foreseeable future even though several states have placed a ceiling upon the funds which may come from this source. Student financial aid programs will continue to receive a great amount of attention and the availability of money for low cost student loans will continue to be important. Tuition will continue to increase as costs increase but hopefully at a slower rate of increase.

Emphasis Upon Cost Based Funding Formulas

A recently published monograph describes the ways in which various states provide support to their community colleges. This report indicates that 16 states have based their support formulas upon some type of cost based analysis. These formulas vary a great deal. Even several of the states which were otherwise classified indicated some form of differential support which was related to costs of instruction. The technique for arriving at realistic costs and subsequently for applying this information in some type of support formula is not always well developed. The availability of computers for analysis, for simulations, and for other computations make this methodology possible, however, for the first time in these recent years.

The Future

Increasingly the state-level agencies will require a common data base which can be used in developing cost analyses. Support formulas will allocate funds to institutions based upon the relative proportions of their total budget needs which are represented by relative costs of various programs. The incentive to emphasize the less expensive programs will thereby be removed, permitting instead the individual colleges to develop the more expensive occupational programs needed by their own communities. Other services will also be included in these cost

analyses so that a realistic budget when it is related to actual institutional program needs can be evolved.

Implications of Collective Bargaining Agreements

An increasing number of states have provided a legal basis for collective bargaining. While in most instances the students have no designated or specific part to play in this process, there have been expressions of student interests and concerns especially when services are withheld or are considered for withholding. The current practice of institutional bargaining has been modified in one or two states where bargaining was carried out at the state level. The implications these procedures have for student input as well as the anomalous position of the institutional administration clouds the issues as the contracts directly affect institutional budgets and the allocation of resources within those budgets. Collapse of local unit boards of trustees bargaining has resulted upon occasion in a call for legislative decision making.

The Future

The picture is unclear. Collective bargaining as a procedure will likely increase in its effect in a number of ways upon institutional budgets. The limitations thus placed upon the institutional decision making relative to allocating resources will become an important factor in determining expenditures within the institution by forces which may not be a part of the institution. This dichotomy may become unacceptable and the definite relationships between allocating funds to an institution by the state and the expenditures of these funds by an institution may result in increasing state level influences over institutional budget expenditures. This is an indirect but specific result of collective bargaining. The effect of student concerns are even more difficult to assess. The part they will play will be related to services (the quality of services) and to student fee support.

Summary of Future Directions Number Two

Speculation about the future is valid if there is basis for observing the present. The future cannot be radically different from the present, it must be built upon it. Unknown influences will change the more distant future, however. In any case, we can operate with some degree of confidence that in reference to financial support, we may expect that:

1. There will be limits placed on total community college enrollments within the immediate future by legislatures.
2. There will be increased state support for community colleges accompanied at the same time by decreased local support.
3. There will be increased provision for accountability as a requirement. This will result in a more completely developed Management Information System.
4. Student tuition will not be decreased or eliminated.
5. The use of cost-based support formula will increase as a method of fund allocation.
6. Collective bargaining procedures will cause more state imposed restrictions on institutional expenditures.

FUTURE DIRECTION NUMBER THREE: INCREASED OUTSIDE DOMINANCE

We have already indicated that several forces are causing an increase in state level decision making. The expansive and restrictive forces which affect higher education placed the legislature in between the restrictive outside agencies on one hand and the expansive boards of trustees on the other. The legislature representing a powerful outside force may move from serving the institutions to dominating them from time to time. We note that there are a number of agencies, however, which have influence upon institutional autonomy. These may be listed as follows (Glenny calls them the anonymous decision makers):

State Level Agencies

1. Higher Education Commission
2. State Building Commission
3. 1202 Commissions

4. Departments of Administration

5. Legislative Aides

6. State Employment Agencies

7. Budget Commission

8. Governor's Office

9. State Planning Commission

Federal Agencies

1. Affirmative Action Agencies

2. Title I

3. Handicapped Policies

4. HEW - OE in particular

Others - Not Voluntary

1. Accrediting Agencies -- especially the specialized ones

2. Foundations

3. National Associations

Summary of Future Direction Number Three

These trends would seem to clearly indicate that the future will be characterized by:

1. Increased state domination.

2. Increased federal imposition.

3. Increased outside direction controls.

4. Decision making more and more difficult.

COLLEGE PARTICIPANTS

BREVARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dr. Maxwell C. King
Mrs. Betty P. Parrish
Mr. George Ritchie
Mr. George F. Schlatter

BROWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dr. Hugh Adams
Mr. George E. Mayer
Mr. John Payne

CENTRAL FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. L. K. Cannon, Jr.
Mr. Herbert S. Coleman
Dr. Henry Goodlett
Mr. Scott Jordan
Mrs. Marjorie A. Renfroe
Dr. N. William Ritz
Mr. Robert P. Sandlin

CHIPOLA JUNIOR COLLEGE

Dr. Raymond M. Deming
Mr. Robert Laney, Jr.
Mr. Benjamin F. Pete
Mrs. Marjorie P. Sangaree
Mr. James S. Sheffield

DAYTONA BEACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mrs. Sally M. Gillispie
Mrs. Jeanne M. Goddard
Mr. Ray Mercer
Dr. Charles Polk

EDISON COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mrs. Ida S. Baker
Mr. Kenton H. Haymans
Mrs. Jody Hendry

FLORIDA JUNIOR COLLEGE AT JACKSONVILLE

Ms. Peggy Friedmann
Mrs. Jewell Haddock
Mr. Donald T. Martin
Mr. Albert H. Rumph
Mr. Charles E. Simmons
Mrs. Sarah P. Sova

FLORIDA KEYS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mrs. Helen Lawler
Dr. John Smith

GULF COAST COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dr. Lawrence W. Tyree

INDIAN RIVER COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. Ben L. Bryan, Sr.
Mr. Standish Crews
Mr. Guy Cromwell
Mr. Robert H. Hazel
Mrs. Ida Morgan

LAKE-SUMTER COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. Daniel B. McCormick
Mrs. Beulah Savage

MANATEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mrs. Florine J. Abel
Dr. William F. Wetzler

MIAMI-DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dr. Maria C. Hernandez
Dr. Peter Masiko, Jr.

NORTH FLORIDA JUNIOR COLLEGE

Mrs. Lynn S. Blow
Mr. Warren T. Jarvis
Miss Mildred Parrish
Mr. Norman O. Protsman
Dr. Stephen T. McMahon

OKALOOSA-WALTON JUNIOR COLLEGE

Mr. Andy Anderson
Mrs. Nancy A. Connors
Dr. Ed McCracken
Mr. A. L. Nabors

PALM BEACH JUNIOR COLLEGE

Mr. George Michael
Dr. Robert L. Smith

PASCO-HERNANDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. Lorenzo E. Coffie
Mr. Roy F. Corrigan
Mr. Murray Grubbs
Dr. Milton O. Jones
Mrs. Lois R. Linville
Mr. Leland P. McKeown
Mrs. Travis L. Slayden

PENSACOLA JUNIOR COLLEGE

Miss Katie Barrineau
Mr. Samuel S. Dixon
Dr. John T. Griffin
Dr. Felton Harrison
Dr. Wallace C. Mayo
Dr. Elaine Montgomery

POLK COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. Lorin T. Bice, Jr.
Dr. Fred Lenfestey

ST. JOHNS RIVER JUNIOR COLLEGE

Mr. William R. Cotton
Mr. Frank M. Hancock
Mr. Robert E. Hudson
Mrs. Melba K. Ilgen
Mrs. Annie Lee Keys
Mr. Robert N. Pickens

ST. PETERSBURG JUNIOR COLLEGE

Dr. Mike Bennett
Mr. William Gilkey
Mr. W. Richard Johnston
Mr. Joseph H. Lang
Mrs. Beatrice F. Lewis

SANTA FE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. Clarence T. Ayers
Ms. Elizabeth Jones
Mr. Alan Robertson

SEMINOLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. J. Wendell Agee
Mr. John Daniels
Dr. Earl Weldon

TALLAHASSEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. Richard W. D'Alemberte
Mr. Frank Lawhon, Sr.
Mr. Charlie M. Macon
Mrs. Harriet M. Wilson

VALENCIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. Willie J. Bruton
Dr. James Gollattscheck
Mrs. Barbara G. Lupfer
Mr. Raymer Maguire
Mrs. Anne M. McKinnon
Mr. Robert C. Scott
Mr. Joseph B. Shirah

NON-COLLEGE PARTICIPANTS

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE
Ms. Huette Higgs

FLORIDA ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
Dr. James S. Kellerman
Ms. Kay Morris

DIVISION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
Mr. Thomas M. Baker
Dr. Myron R. Blee
Mrs. Jerry Smith